	IN THE UNITED ST FOR THE DISTRIC	TATES DISTRICT COURT FT OF SOUTH CA ROLINA BLARK'S DEFICE	
Yvette Cole, v.	Plaintiff,	2009 APR -3 A 9: 4-)) BUSTRICT COURT BUSTRICT OF SOUTH CAROL!! (HARLESTON, SC) Civil Action No. 9:09-324-SB	
State of South Carolina; and Hampton County,		ORDER	
	Defendants.	<i>)</i>))	

This matter is before the Court upon the *pro se* Plaintiff's complaint, wherein she alleges that the Defendants failed to protect her property from trespassers and violated her civil rights. Pursuant to Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), this matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On March 9, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("R&R"), analyzing the issues and recommending that the Court dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. In the R&R, the Magistrate Judge determined that the State of South Carolina is entitled to dismissal because it is not a "person" within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Furthermore, with respect to Hampton County, the Magistrate Judge noted that the Plaintiff has failed to raise any allegations that would show that the County maintains a discriminatory policy to render it liable pursuant to § 1983. Finally, the Magistrate Judge noted that the Plaintiff has already raised these same allegations in this Court, albeit unsuccessfully, and the Court has no duty to "grind the same corn a second time." Aloe Creme Labs., Inc. v. Francine Co., 425 F.2d 1295, 1296 (5th Cir. 1970).

5

Attached to the Magistrate Judge's R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of her right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within ten days after being served with a copy. To date, no written objections have been filed.

Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriner's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court need not conduct a *de novo* review of any portions of the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R as the Order of this Court, and it is

ORDERED that the Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Honorable Sol Platt, Jr.

Senior United States District Judge

April _____, 2009 Charleston, South Carolina